

Remarks

Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 15, and 51 – 64 are pending. Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 15, and 51 – 64 presently stand rejected. By this amendment, claims 1 – 3, 5 – 15, and 51 – 64 remain unchanged. Examination and reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks are respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 10, and 51 – 59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6132311 (“Williams”) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0214097 (“Moody”).

Independent claims 1 and 51 are directed to a gaming machine that plays a game and includes a display and a game controller. The controller controls the game which includes a plurality of sub-games. The controller determines a first partial outcome of a first one of the sub-games, and derives an expected value from the first partial outcome. Using the expected value, the controller selects a partial outcome for each of the remaining sub-games, and displays the partial outcomes of all of the sub-games. Each of the partial outcomes is thereafter used to provide a final outcome of each one of the sub-games. The final outcomes provide an outcome of the game.

Williams, on the other hand, discloses that a player is dealt two community cards face up from a shuffled deck of cards. See col. 6, lines 6 – 13. Five partial hands of three cards are also dealt face down from the same deck. See col. 6, lines 6 – 13. The facedown cards are then turned face up. See col. 7, lines 1 – 3. Based on combining the community cards and the partial hands, a game outcome is determined for each of the five hands.

Williams fails to describe that a display of one sub-game controls the display of other sub-games, not to mention determining an expected value of a partial outcome of one sub-game to select the partial outcomes of the remaining sub-games, which are displayed. That is,

Williams does not use one five-card poker game to control what cards are displayed in the other four five-card poker games.

Moody fails to cure any of these deficiencies.

Rather, Moody discloses a first player hand 60 (all five cards of the “sub-game”) having an expected value which is used to determine a number of second hands 70 and 80 (all five cards of each of the remaining “sub-games”). See paragraph [0034]. All three hands (the entire five cards) are then displayed in a player selection screen. See Figure 2. The player then selects one of the multiple hands to play in the game and the other hands are discarded. See paragraph [0013]. When the player wagers to play multiple hands, only the selected hand is replicated for each wagered hand as shown in Figure 3.

In other words, rather than having a game where a partial outcome of a sub-game is used to select the partial outcome of the sub-games, as defined by claims 1 and 51, the game according to Moody will always show the entire outcome for a sub-game, which entire outcome provides an expected value to select other entire sub-game outcomes..

Thus, even if one were motivated to combine the teachings of Williams and Moody, one would still fail to arrive at the claimed invention since neither Williams nor Moody teaches or suggests a gaming machine arranged to display a partial outcome of each of a plurality of sub-games whereby fewer than a full set of images of each of the sub-games is displayed. Nor that an expected value is derived from a partial outcome of a sub-game and is used to select the fewer than full set of images of the remaining sub-games in the initial display.

Therefore, claim 1 and 51 are allowable in view of Williams and Moody.

Claims 2, 3, 5 – 10, and claims 52 – 59 are dependent from claims 1 and 51, respectively. Therefore, claims 2, 3, 5 – 10, and claims 52 – 59 are also allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 51.

Claims 11 – 14, and 60 – 63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of Moody and U.S. Pub. No 2002/0183105 (“Cannon”).

Claims 11 – 14 depend from claim 1. Claims 60 – 63 depend from claim 51. Therefore, claims 11 – 14, and 60 – 63 are allowable in view of Williams and Moody.

Cannon fails to cure the deficiencies of Williams and Moody. Rather, Cannon discloses a gaming machine that allows mutually concurrent play of a plurality of games of chances on a single display screen.

Cannon does not describe any expected value of a first sub-game as derived from the displayed partial outcome of the first sub-game being used to select the displayed fewer than full set of images of the remaining sub-games in the initial display.

Therefore, claims 11 – 14, and 60 – 63 are allowable in view of Williams, Moody, and Cannon for at least the same reasons set forth above.

Claims 15, and 64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams and Moody, in view of Cannon and U.S. Pub. No 2003/0054877 (“Baerlocher”).

Claim 15 depends from allowable claim 1. Claim 64 depends from claim 51. Therefore, claims 15 and 64 are also allowable in view of Williams, Moody, and Cannon.

Baerlocher fails to cure the deficiencies of Williams, Moody, and Cannon. Rather, Baerlocher merely discloses partially revealing a first award on display device of a gaming apparatus.

Baerlocher does not describe any expected value of a first sub-game as derived from the displayed partial outcome of the first sub-game being used to select the displayed fewer than full set of images of the remaining sub-games in the initial display.

Therefore, claims 15 and 64 are allowable in view of Williams, Moody, Cannon and Baerlocher for at least the same reasons set forth above.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that all of claims 1 – 3, 5 – 15, and 51 – 64 are allowable. In the event that the Examiner believes a telephone interview with the undersigned Applicants' Representative would be helpful in advancing prosecution of this patent application, the undersigned is available for telephone consultation.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 12, 2010

/Larry M. Jarvis/
Larry M. Jarvis
Reg. No. 27,341

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 W. Madison Street
34th Floor
Chicago, IL 60661
Phone (312) 775-8000
Fax (312) 775-8100